DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 111 CS 010 886

AUTHOR Johnson, Jessie
TITLE Adaptation of Curriculum, Instructional Methods, and Materials Component, Instructional Assistant Program 1990-91. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE 18 Mar 92
NOTE 58p.; For the 1988-89 report, see ED 313 667.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Early Intervention; Grade 1; *Instructional Effectiveness; Kindergarten; Primary Education; Reading Research; Reading Skills; *Remedial Reading; *Teacher Aides
IDENTIFIERS *Columbus Public Schools OH; Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills; Metropolitan Achievement Tests

ABSTRACT

Funded through the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund, the Instructional Assistant Program of the Columbus, Ohio public schools provided direct instructional service to selected pupils in the classroom setting. The program was located in 60 buildings, with an equivalent of 147 assistants serving 202 teachers and 2048 pupils in kindergarten and first grade, and provided daily activities to strengthen and extend regular classroom instruction. Emphasis was placed on activities which would increase the oral and written language and reading skills needed to be successful in school. Evaluation data included results of standardized tests and locally constructed surveys. Results indicated that: (1) the attendance criterion was met by 35% of the 445 kindergarten pupils served and 49% of the 1603 first-grade pupils served; (2) improvements of 3.0 or more normal curve equivalents were achieved by 67% of the kindergarten evaluation sample and 53% of the first-grade sample on the Total Reading test and by 68% of the kindergarten sample on the Oral Comprehension test; (3) 79% of the kindergarten teacher ratings and 84% of the first-grade teacher ratings agreed that pupil success was attributable to the services of the instructional assistant; (4) more than 80% of the assistants rated inservice meetings as very informative and worthwhile; and (5) 86% of the first-grade pupils were promoted. Findings support continuation of the program. Recommendations include having teachers as well as assistants attend inservice meetings, and continuation of school visitation by the program evaluator. (Sixteen tables of data are included; evaluation forms, survey instruments, and five tables of data are attached.) (RS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED343111

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

# ADAPTATION OF CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS, AND MATERIALS COMPONENT INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM

1990-91

Written by:

Jessie Johnson
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Computer Analysis by:

Kathy Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS010686



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
ADAPTATION OF CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS, AND MATERIALS COMPONENT
INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM
1990-91

ABSTRACT

Description: The Instructional Assistant Program served 2048 pupils in kindergarten and first grade. Funding of the program was made available through the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund of 1990-91.

The goal of the program is to provide educational support for underachieving pupils. The instructional assistants were trained to provide direct instructional service to selected pupils in the classroom setting. Teachers involved with the program were assigned an assistant for one-half day and provided direct supervision for the assistant.

The program was located in 60 buildings with an equivalent of 147 assistants serving 202 teachers. The average number of pupils served by an assistant was 18.9 in kindergarten, and 18.9 in first grade.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes, the Instructional Assistant Program started September 24, for first grade and October 1, 1990 for kindergarten. For evaluation based on standardized test data (first grade Objective 1.0 and kindergarten objectives 1.0 and 2.0), the time interval ended March 28, 1991. This provided a maximum of 111 possible days of instruction for kindergarten pupils, or 116 days for grade one pupils. An additional 20 scheduled days (through May 3, 1991) were included in the time interval for evaluation of first grade Objective 2.0, not based on standardized test data, providing a maximum of 136 days for grade one pupils. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analysis for the time interval which ended March 28, 1991 (first grade Objective 1.0 and kindergarten Objectives 1.0 and 2.0), first grade pupils must have attended 92.8 days and kindergarten pupils 88.8 days. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses for the time interval ending May 3, 1991 (first grade Objective 2.0), first grade pupils must have attended 108.8 days.

Activities: Implementation of the program was accomplished through daily instructional activities to strengthen and extend regular classroom instruction. Emphasis was placed on activities which would increase oral and written language and reading skills needed to be successful in school.

Program Objective: The first two objectives for kindergarten stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils who attend the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period will gain 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Total Reading (Objective 1.0) and in Oral Comprehension (Objective 2.0). Objective 1.0 for first grade stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils who attend the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued will gain at least 3.0 NCE points for the instructional period in Total Reading. Gains for kindergarten and first grade were to be determined by a nationally standardized measure. Objective 2.0 for first grade stated that pupils who attend the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or who were discontinued will demonstrate satisfactory progress in the regular classroom as demonstrated by promotion to the next grade level. For both kindergarten and first grade, Objective 3.0 stated that given the service of a half-time instructional assistant in the classroom, 80 percent of the teachers will observe that pupils receiving instructional assistance by the assistant will improve significantly in reading and language arts as a direct result of that service; and Objective 4.0 for both grades stated that meaningful training sessions would be provided for participants regarding materials and skills necessary to perform the stated tasks of the instructional assistants. For Objective 4.0, Criterion 4.1 stated that 80 percent of the

participants would perceive each training session to be meaningful while Criterion 4.2 stated that 80 percent of the participants would perceive the content of the training sessions as helpful in the classroom setting.

Evaluation Design: The major evaluation effort was accomplished through the collection and analysis of the Vocabulary and Oral Comprehension Test of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Level A (CTBS; 1981) for kindergarten. For first grade the Total Reading subtest of the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Form L (MAT6, 1985), Preprimer (Pretest) and Primer (Posttest), were administered to determine achievement gains for first grade pupils. Analyses of the data included comparison between pretest and posttest scores in terms of raw scores, percentiles, and NCEs. Locally constructed surveys were used to obtain data from staff working in the program.

Major Findings/Recommendations: Pupil census information indicated that 445 kindergarten and 1603 first grade pupils were served during the 1990-91 school year.

The attendance criterion was met by 156 kindergarten pupils, or 35.1% of the 445 pupils served. Of these, 140 pupils received both administrations of the achievement test. The attendance criterion, for the time interval which ended March 28, 1991, was met by 782 first grade pupils, or 48.8% of the 1603 pupils served. Of these, 723 received both administrations of the achievement test. The attendance criterion for the time interval which ended May 3, 1991 was met by 773 first grade pupils, or 48.2% of the 1603 pupils served.

A review of the kindergarten data indicates that three of four program objectives were achieved. The data indicated improvements of 3.0 NCE points or more were achieved by 67.1% (94) of the evaluation sample on the Total Reading and 67.9% (95) on Oral Comprehension test. Objectives 1.0 and 2.0 were attained. The data indicated 78.6% (11) of the teacher ratings agreed that pupil success was attributable to the services of the instructional assistant. Objective 3.0 was not attained. The results regarding Objective 4.0 (Criterion 4.1) were combined for kindergarten and first grade. The evaluation instrument was revised by a supervisor outside of the Department of Program Evaluation. Consequently, the data could not be disaggregated by grade level (kindergarten and grade 1). There is evidence that more than 80 percent of the assistants rated the inservice meetings to be very informative, interesting, and worthwhile. In regard to Criterion 4.2, the evidence indicated 97.3% of the kindergarten assistants responded positively regarding the helpfulness of the inservice content for classroom use. Objective 4.0, as specified in Criterion 4.1 and 4.2, was attained.

A review of the first grade data indicates all the program objectives were achieved. Objective 1.0 was achieved; 52.9% (383) of the evaluation sample achieved a gain of 3.0 NCE points or more in Total Reading. In addition, 662 of the 773 pupils (85.6%) were promoted; Objective 2.0 was achieved. Objective 3.0 was achieved. The data indicated 84.5% (115) of the teacher ratings agreed that pupil success was attributable to the instructional assistant. Objective 4.0 was attained regarding Criterion 4.1 (see previous paragraph). In regard to Criterion 4.2 (first grade), the evidence indicated 91.5% of the assistants responded positively regarding the helpfulness of the inservice content for classroom use. Objective 4.0, as specified in Criterion 4.1 and 4.2, was attained.

It is strongly recommended that the Instructional Assistant Program be continued in the 1991-92 school year. The following recommendations are made to enhance program success: inservice meetings should be continued and focused on reading and language arts and that teachers attend inservice meetings as well. School visitation by the program evaluator should be continued next year to monitor evaluation concerns and respond to assistants' needs.

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
ADAPTATION OF CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS, AND MATERIALS COMPONENT
INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM

1990-91

## Program Description

The goal of the Instructional Assistant Program is to provide an educational support program for underachieving pupils. The overall purpose of the program is to significantly improve the reading skills of underachieving pupils at kindergarten and grade one with additional reinforcement provided by a trained instructional assistant. The focus of the intervention strategies is centered on reading and writing using the whole-language approach to instruction. The instructional assistants are trained to provide direct instructional service to selected pupils in the classroom setting. Teachers involved with the program are assigned an assistant for one-half day and provide direct supervision for the assistant. The assistants attend inservice training sessions and are provided with supplementary materials and many instructional activities in the areas of oral language, written language, reading skills, mathematics, and classroom management. The assistants are also provided assistance whenever needed by two program coordinators who regularly visit the assistants at their schools and prepare and present some of the inservice programs to the assistants.

The Instructional Assistant Program was located in 60 buildings with 147 assistants serving 202 teachers. Assistants served first grade classrooms located in 57 buildings with an equivalent of 85.0 assistants serving 175 teachers. Assistants at the kindergarten level provided service in 14 buildings with an equivalent of 23.5 assistants serving 27 teachers. The buildings served by the program are listed below.

Schools Served by the
Instructional Assistant Program

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Arlington Park | East Columbus | Innis | Reeb |
| Avondale* | Eastgate | Kent | Salem |
| Beck* | Easthaven | Koebel | Scioto Trail |
| Binns | East Linden | Leawood | Second* |
| Broadleigh | Fair | Lincoln Park | Siebert |
| Burroughs | Fairmoor | Linden | South Mifflin |
| Cassady | Fifth | Livingston* | Southwood |
| Cedarwood | Franklinton | Main* | Stockbridge |
| Clarfield | Georgian Hts. | Maize | Sullivant* |
| Clinton | Hamilton | McGuffey | Trevitt* |
| Como | Heyl | Medary | Weinland Park* |
| Cranbrook | Highland | Moler | West Broad |
| Dana* | Hubbard* | North Linden | Westgate |
| Deshler | Hudson | Ohio* | West Mound |
| Eakin | Huy | Pilgrim | Windsor |

* Schools with both kindergarten and first grade assistants

## Evaluation Design

### Objectives

Kindergarten. The following objectives provided direction for the kindergarten program component:

Objective 1.0: At least 50 percent of the kindergarten pupils who attend the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period will gain at least 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Total Reading. Gain will be measured by a nationally standardized achievement test.

Objective 2.0: At least 50 percent of the kindergarten pupils who attend the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period will gain at least 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Oral Comprehension. Gain will be measured by a nationally standardized achievement test.

Objective 3.0: Given service of a half time instructional assistant in the classroom, 80 percent of the teachers will perceive that pupils receiving instructional assistance by the assistant improved significantly in reading and language arts as a direct result of that service.

Criterion 3.1 Evidence of pupil improvement in reading and language arts as a result of the services of the assistant as adjudged by the classroom teachers.

Objective 4.0: To provide meaningful training sessions for participants regarding materials and skills necessary to perform the stated tasks of the instructional assistants.

Criterion 4.1 Evidence that 80 percent of the participants perceived each training session to be meaningful.

Criterion 4.2 Evidence that 80 percent of the participants perceived the content of the training sessions as helpful in the classroom setting.

First Grade. The following objectives provided direction for the first grade program component:

Objective 1.0: At least 50 percent of the first grade pupils who attend the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued will gain at least 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Total Reading. Gain will be measured by a nationally standardized achievement test.

Objective 2.0: At least 50 percent of the pupils who attend the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period or were discontinued will demonstrate satisfactory progress in the regular classroom as demonstrated by promotion to the next grade level.

Objective 3.0: Given service of a half time instructional assistant in the classroom, 80 percent of the teachers will perceive that pupils receiving instructional assistance by the assistant improved significantly in reading and language arts as a direct result of that service.

Criterion 3.1 Evidence of pupil improvement in reading and language arts as a result of the services of the assistant as adjudged by the classroom teachers.

Objective 4.0: To provide meaningful training sessions for participants regarding materials and skills necessary to perform the stated tasks of the instructional assistants.

Criterion 4.1 Evidence that 80 percent of the participants perceived each training session to be meaningful.

Criterion 4.2 Evidence that 80 percent of the participants perceived the content of the training sessions as helpful in the classroom setting.

## Program Timeline and Discontinuation of Service

The Instructional Assistant Program timeline was grade specific. For evaluation purposes, the program started September 24, for first grade and October 1, 1990 for kindergarten. For evaluation based on standardized test data (first grade Objective 1.0 and kindergarten Objectives 1.0 and 2.0), the time interval ended March 28, 1991. This provided a maximum of 111 possible days of instruction for kindergarten pupils, or 116 days for grade one pupils. An additional 20 scheduled days (through May 3, 1991) were included in the time interval for evaluation of first grade Objective 2.0, not based on standardized test data, providing a maximum of 136 days for grade one pupils. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analysis for the time interval which ended March 28, 1991 (first grade Objective 1.0 and kindergarten Objectives 1.0 and 2.0), first grade pupils must have attended 92.8 days or have been discontinued and kindergarten pupils must have attended 88.8 days. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses for the time interval ending May 3, 1991 (first grade Objective 2.0), first grade pupils must have attended 108.8 days or have been discontinued.

The term "discontinued" was used only in conjunction with first grade pupils and indicated a pupil had met the program's criteria for termination of service and would no longer receive daily service from the instructional assistant. The procedures and criteria for discontinuance were generated and managed by Federal and State Programs.

## Instruments

The evaluation design provided for the collection of data in five areas of program operation. Except for the standardized achievement tests, the instruments used to collect the data are found in the Appendix.

1. Standardized Achievement Test Information

The Vocabulary and Oral Comprehension test of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Level A (CTBS, 1981), was used to determine kindergarten pupil achievement gains. For grade one the Reading subtest of the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Form L (MAT6, 1985), Preprimer (Pretest) and Primer (Posttest), were administered to determine first grade pupils achievement gains. The pretest for first grade was administered the week of September 17, 1990 and September 24, 1990 for kindergarten. The posttest was administered the week of April 8, 1991.

2. Pupil Census Information

Calendar Worksheet. The Calendar Worksheet was used by program teachers and assistants to record pupil service information (see p. 38, Appendix B).

Pupil Data Sheet. A Pupil Data Sheet (locally constructed) was completed by program assistants and teachers for each pupil served. This instrument provided the following information: English speaking status, pupil progress, hours per week of instruction, discontinuation status, and days of pupil service (see p. 39, Appendix B).

3. Classroom Teacher Survey Information

The Classroom Teacher Survey was completed by the teachers to whom assistants were assigned. The purpose of the instrument was to obtain teachers' perceptions of: (a) impact of the assistants' services on the pupils' reading skills, and (b) various aspects of the functioning of the program in the classroom. The locally developed survey was administered during May 1991. Copies of the Classroom Teacher Surveys can be found on pp. 33-34 and 40-41, Appendix A and B.

4. Inservice Evaluation Information

Instructional assistants were provided with an orientation inservice in September, 1991; they were asked to respond to the Orientation Evaluation Form (see p. 31, Appendix A) at the end of the session. In addition, fifteen inservice training sessions were provided for the instructional assistants throughout the school year. At the end of each session, the assistants were asked to rate the value of the session by completing the Instructional Assistant Program Training Survey (see p. 32, Appendix A).

5. Instructional Assistant Survey Information

During early May 1991, the Instructional Assessment Instrument (pp. 35-36 and 42-43, Appendix A and B) was sent to all instructional assistants for them to assess the degree to which the content of the training sessions were adjudged to be of help in fulfilling their responsibilities in the classroom.

In addition to the types of data specified in the evaluation design, process evaluation data were obtained via on-site visitations to program classrooms. Findings are discussed later in this report.

## Major Findings

### Kindergarten Component

The pupil census information is summarized in Table 1. The program served 445 pupils during the 1990-91 school year. The average number of pupils served during the year by the 23.5 assistants was 18.9. Instructional service was scheduled for an average of 98.5 program days and pupils received service for an average of 85.1 days during the instructional period of the program. The average daily membership (ADM) in the kindergarten component was 334.7. The average hours of instruction per week was 3.2.

First priority for pupil selection was given to underachieving pupils not served by Chapter 1 programs. Second priority for selection was at the option of the classroom teacher to include underachievers who were also being served in other competency education programs. Of the 445 pupils who were served by the program, 215 (48.3%) were also served in other compensatory education programs.

Pupils who attended 80% (88.8) of the program days for the time interval which ended March 28, 1991, had valid pretest and posttest scores, and were English speaking (for Objective 1 and 2) comprised the evaluation sample. The attendance criterion was met by 158 pupils; of those who received both administrations of the achievement test, 140 had valid scores on Total Reading and Oral Comprehension. Data from testing are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

Analyses of pretest-posttest change scores of raw scores, percentiles, and normal curve equivalents (NCEs) were conducted. For the reader who is interested in the pre-and-posttest results for the number of correct responses and for percentile statistics, tables are included in Appendix C, Tables C-1 and C-2, page 45.

Although the results for the number of correct responses and for percentile statistics are available in the appendixes, the reader should be wary of trying to extrapolate these results into comparisons of pupils achievement. Raw scores are equal units of measurement, but can only provide a limited interpretation of achievement data. Percentiles provide comparative information but are not equal units of measure. Caution is advised in drawing conclusions about program impact from any of the scores above. Normal curve equivalents (NCEs) are generally considered to provide the truest indication of pupil growth in achievement, since they provide comparative information in equal units of measurement. Data for normal curve equivalents for the Total Reading and Oral Comprehension tests are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

The overall NCE gain for the program averaged 11.3 points on the Total Reading test. While the overall NCE gain on the Oral Comprehension test averaged 9.9 points (see Table 2).

Table 3 contains Total Reading and Oral Comprehension test data related to changes in NCE scores for three ranges: (a) no improvement in NCE scores (<0.5); (b) some improvement in NCE scores (0.5 to 2.9); and (c) substantial improvement in NCE scores (3.0 or more). Total Reading test data indicated that 98 (70.0%) pupils made gains in NCE scores. More specifically, 94 (67.1%) made substantial improvement and 4 (2.9%) made some improvement in NCE scores, while 42 (30.0%) made no improvement.

Table 1
Number of Pupils Served, Averages for Days Scheduled, Days Served,
Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week, and
Pupils Attending 80% of Days
Reported for Kindergarten
1990-91

| Grade | Pupils Served | Girls | Boys | Average Days Scheduled | Average Days Served | Average Daily Membership | Average Hrs. of Inst. Per Pupil Per Week |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| K | 445 | 194 | 251 | 98.5 | 85.1 | 334.7 | 3.2 |

Table 2
Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Total Reading and
Oral Comprehension Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE)
Reported for Kindergarten
1990-91

| Test | Number of Pupils | Pretest Min. | Pretest Max. | Pretest Average NCE | Pretest Standard Deviation | Posttest Min. | Posttest Max. | Posttest Average NCE | Posttest Standard Deviation | Average Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Reading | 140 | 1 | 88 | 29.9 | 16.6 | 1 | 94 | 41.3 | 20.3 | 11.3 |
| Oral Comprehension | 140 | 12 | 89 | 31.9 | 16.3 | 1 | 88 | 41.9 | 19.3 | 9.9 |

Table 3
Number and Percent of Pupils in Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE)
Score Improvement Change Categories in Total Reading and
Oral Comprehension for Kindergarten Pupils
1990-91

| Test | Pupils in Sample | No Improvement ( < 0.5 ) | | Some Improvement (0.5 to 2.9) | | Substantial Improvement (3.0 or more) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Total Reading | 140 | 42 | 30.0 | 4 | 2.9 | 94 | 67.1 |
| Oral Comprehension | 140 | 42 | 30.0 | 3 | 2.1 | 95 | 67.9 |



EVALSRVCS/P518/RPTFAID91
03/18/92

The first evaluation objective set a goal that at least 50 percent of the evaluation sample pupils would gain 3.0 NCE points for the instructional period in Total Reading. Objective 1.0 was met with 67.1% (94) of the pupils gaining 3.0 NCE points or more for the instructional period. In addition, Table 3 contains Oral Comprehension test results regarding changes in NCE scores for the three ranges. The data indicate 95 (67.9%) pupils made substantial improvement, 3 (2.1%) made some improvement and 42 (30.0%) made no improvement. The second objective set a goal that at least 50 percent of the evaluation sample pupils would gain 3.0 NCE points for the instructional period in Oral Comprehension. Objective 2.0 was met with 67.9% (95) of the pupils gaining 3.0 NCE points or more.

The third objective stated that, given the service of a half time instructional assistant in the classroom, 80 percent of the teachers will observe that pupils receiving instructional assistance by the assistant will improve significantly in reading and language arts as a direct result of that service. In May the teachers participating in the program were surveyed to evaluate their perceptions of the impact of the services of the assistants on kindergarten pupils' reading readiness skills. Of the 27 teachers surveyed, 15 (55.6%) returned the survey. The first part of the survey asked the teachers to respond to eight statements concerning the performance of the instructional assistant as well as the adequacy of the CTBS testing instrument. The second part of the survey asked the teachers to respond to 11 statements concerning the degree of progress by target pupils which could be attributed to the efforts of the instructional assistant. The third part of the survey asked teachers to indicate the number of pupils retained, the number that might have been retained were it not for the services of the instructional assistant, and the number of non-target group pupils retained. The teachers responded to the items in Part 1 and 2 using a 5-point rating scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Tables 4, 5, and 6 contain a summary of responses to the three parts of the survey (see pp. 33 and 34, Appendix A).

The data indicated 11 (78.6%) of the teachers were in agreement with item 1 (Table 4) regarding the degree of pupil success being attributable to the instructional assistant. Teacher ratings for each item were generally below the 80% criterion stated in the objective. Thus, Criterion 3.1 specified in Objective 3.0 was not attained.

Response to items 2 and 5 (Table 4) indicated that instructional materials made by the assistant were useful in working with children and that during readiness activities assistants related well to pupils. Of the 15 teachers responding to item 6 (Table 4), 9 indicated that the CTBS was not an accurate measure of reading readiness; the other teachers were unsure (4) or agreed (2) with the accuracy of the measure. Responses to item 7 indicated that test instructions were inadequate. Responses to item 8 indicated that most teachers felt that the time allotted for testing was inadequate.

Classroom teachers gave an average response of 4.0 or more (on a 5-point scale) on 7 of the 11 skill areas listed in Table 5. The survey also highlighted 4 areas of possible concern (items 8-11) which were indicated by more than 20 percent of the responding teachers. The overall average rating of the 11 areas was 3.9.

Teacher responses to part three of the survey, Table 6, indicated that 10 target pupils were to be retained; a total of 20 additional pupils might have been retained were it not for the services of the instructional assistants and

Table 4
Average Response and Percent of Responses to
Part 1 of the Classroom
Teacher Survey (Kindergarten)

| Item | Number Responding | Average Response | Percent SD (1) | D (2) | U (3) | A (4) | SA (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The overall readiness to read of pupils in the target group has improved significantly as a direct result of interacting with the instructional assistant. | 14 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 7.1 | 42.9 | 35.7 |
| 2. The instructional materials made by the assistant were useful in working with children | 15 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 6.7 | 33.3 | 46.7 |
| 3. The instructional assistant has a basic understanding of how kindergarten pupils begin to read. | 15 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 26.7 | 46.7 |
| 4. The Resource Guide and Handbook developed for the program has been of great value to the assistant in helping pupils. | 15 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.7 | 46.7 | 26.7 |
| 5. During readiness activities, the instructional assistant relates well to the pupils. | 15 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 13.3 | 73.3 |
| 6. The CTBS test instrument seemed to be an accurate measure of reading readiness. | 15 | 2.1 | 46.7 | 13.3 | 26.7 | 13.3 | 0.0 |
| 7. The instructions given to complete the CTBS testing process were adequate. | 15 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 66.7 | 6.7 |
| 8. The time allotted for testing was adequate. | 15 | 3.1 | 20.0 | 13.3 | 6.7 | 53.3 | 6.7 |

Note. Ratings were based on the following scale: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

Table 5
Average Response and Percent of Responses to
Part 2 of the Classroom
Teacher Survey (Kindergarten)

| Item | Number Responding | Average Response | Percent SD (1) | D (2) | U (3) | A (4) | SA (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Relate and share experiences and stories in correct sequence | 15 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 13.3 | 53.3 | 26.7 |
| 2. Write the letters of the alphabet | 15 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 40.0 | 46.7 |
| 3. Write their names and numbers (1-20) | 15 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 46.7 | 40.0 |
| 4. Deliver oral messages correctly | 15 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 46.7 | 33.3 |
| 5. Listen and respond to stories, poems, plays and other literary forms | 15 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 33.3 | 40.0 |
| 6. Recall details, and stories | 15 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 53.3 | 33.3 |
| 7. Differentiate likes, similarities, shapes, sizes, facts and fantasies | 15 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 46.7 | 40.0 |
| 8. Know the sounds of single consonants | 14 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 14.3 | 35.7 | 28.6 |
| 9. Match words to pictures | 15 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 26.7 | 46.7 | 20.0 |
| 10. Read familiar sentences | 15 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 46.7 | 26.7 |
| 11. Recognize the 10 basic words introduced in the Houghton Mifflin series | 15 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 20.0 | 46.7 | 20.0 |

Note. Ratings were based on the following scale: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

5 non-target pupils were to be retained as judged by those teachers responding. It should be noted, the information presented in Table 6, Part 3, represents teachers' responses to the survey prior to the change in school practice regarding pupil retention. In the Spring of 1990, the Early Childhood Committee stated that the retention of kindergarten pupils was not to be the general practice in the Columbus Public Schools. The data are presented to give the reader a view of the teachers' perceptions prior to the change.

Table 6
Number of Responses to Part 3 of the
Classroom Teacher Survey (Kindergarten)

| Item | Number of Teachers | Number of Pupils |
|---|---|---|
| 1. How many instructional assistant program target pupils are you retaining this year because of reading deficiencies? | 15 | 10 |
| 2. How many additional instructional assistant program target pupils might you have retained, because of reading deficiencies, were it not for the services of the instructional assistant? | 15 | 20 |
| 3. How many non-target group pupils are you retaining this year? | 15 | 5 |

In summary, results indicate that Objective 3.0 was not achieved. However, teacher ratings were not as positive as expected, and would appear to highlight the following areas of concern: the inadequacy of the CTBS as an accurate measure of reading readiness, the inadequacy of time allotted for testing, the inadequacy of instructions given to complete the CTBS testing process, and inadequacy of efforts of instructional assistant for some activities related to reading and language arts (items 8-11).

The fourth objective stated that meaningful training sessions would be provided for participants regarding materials and skills necessary to perform effectively as an instructional assistant, as specified in Criterion 4.1. During the year, a series of 15 inservice sessions were provided for the kindergarten and first grade instructional assistants. At the end of each

session, the assistants were asked to rate the value of the session by completing the Orientation Evaluation Form (September, 1990) and the Instructional Assistant Program Training Survey for all other meetings (see pp. 31-32, Appendix A). Reports were given to Federal and State Programs following each meeting. The meetings were rated highly by participants. Comments by assistants indicated they favored full day inservice sessions in order to broaden their understanding of the subjects presented and would like to have the classroom teacher given the opportunity to attend the inservice as well. The overall evaluation results of the content presented at the sessions is summarized for kindergarten and grade 1 (combined) in Table 7. The evaluation instrument used to evaluate the inservice meetings was revised by a supervisor outside of the Department of Program Evaluation. Consequently, the data could not be disaggregated by grade level (kindergarten and grade 1). The evidence shows that the assistants perceived the inservice sessions to be very informative, interesting, and worthwhile. Thus, Criterion 4.1 (see p. 2), as specified in Objective 4.0 (for kindergarten and first grade), was achieved. The dates and topics of inservice meetings for the 1990-91 school year are listed and can be found in Appendix C, Table C-5, page 47.

Table 7
Instructional Assistants' Responses Relating to the
Fifteen Inservice Sessions

| | Content Presented Was | N | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. | Very Informative | 445 | 81.9 |
| | Informative | 96 | 17.7 |
| | Not Informative | 2 | 0.4 |
| b. | Very Interesting | 418 | 79.5 |
| | Interesting | 103 | 19.6 |
| | Not Very Interesting | 5 | 0.9 |
| c. | Very Worthwhile | 422 | 80.4 |
| | Worthwhile | 97 | 18.5 |
| | Not Worthwhile | 6 | 1.1 |

In May 1991, the Instructional Assessment Instrument was sent to the kindergarten instructional assistants (see pp. 35-36, Appendix A). The purpose of this instrument was to assess the value of the inservice after the assistants had an opportunity to apply the inservice training and materials in the classroom. The assistants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with 12 statements using a 5-point scale. Of the 27 assistants, 25 (92.6%) returned the survey. Table 8 contains the findings. Overall, there was a 97.3% positive response of the 12 statements regarding the value of inservice listed in Table 8. The evidence outlined in Table 8 shows that Criterion 4.2 was attained. While assistants' ratings were more positive than anticipated, they did highlight one area of possible concern (i.e., the inadequacy of the Resource Guide and Handbook for use on a weekly basis).

Table 8
Average Response and Percent of Responses for the
Instructional Assessment Instrument (Kindergarten)

| Item | Number Responding | Average Response | Percent SD (1) | D (2) | U (3) | A (4) | SA (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. As a result of the inservice training sessions, I have a greater understanding of how kindergarteners get ready to read. | 25 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 44.0 |
| 2. The inservice training sessions helped me to effectively participate in a kindergarten classroom. | 25 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 44.0 |
| 3. As a result of the inservice training sessions, I have a better understanding of the concerns and responsibilities that a kindergarten teacher has toward the instruction of beginning reading. | 25 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| 4. The topics presented in the inservice training sessions were helpful to me in understanding my job in the classroom. | 25 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 48.0 | 48.0 |
| 5. I understand how the Houghton Mifflin reading series is to be used at the kindergarten level. | 24 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 8.3 | 70.8 | 16.7 |
| 6. During the inservice training sessions, I learned many activities and instructional methods which may be used in the instruction of reading with kindergarten pupils. | 24 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45.8 | 54.2 |
| 7. These inservice sessions made me aware of the instructional resources made available by our school system. | 25 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 60.0 | 36.0 |

(table continues)

Table 8 (continued)
Average Response and Percent of Responses for the
Instructional Assessment Instrument (Kindergarten)

| Item | Number Responding | Average Response | Percent SD (1) | D (2) | U (3) | A (4) | SA (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. After the inservice training sessions, I felt prepared to help children in learning to read. | 25 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.0 | 28.0 |
| 9. I shared information from the inservice training sessions with the kindergarten teacher(s) to whom I am assigned. | 25 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 44.0 |
| 10. The teacher(s) I work with has shared ideas and shown me ways to become better at helping pupils learn to read. | 25 | 4.2 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 44.0 | 48.0 |
| 11. I used the Resource Guide and Handbook on at least a weekly basis. | 25 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 16.0 | 48.0 | 28.0 |
| 12. The Resource Guide and Handbook was very useful to me in the instruction of reading and language arts skills. | 25 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 8.0 | 36.0 | 44.0 |

Note. Ratings were based on the following scale: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor record keeping procedures of kindergarten and first grade pupils; the program evaluator also visited a randomly selected group of program assistants to review records. A summary of the results is contained in the first grade component section of this document(see p. 22).

First Grade Component

The pupil census information indicated that 1603 pupils were served by the project during the 1990-91 school year. The average number of pupils served during the year by the 85 assistants was 18.9. Instructional service was scheduled for an average of 109.5 program days and pupils received service for an average of 95.9 days during the treatment period of the program. The average daily membership (ADM) in the first grade component was 1290.7. The average hours of instruction per week was 2.6.

First priority for pupil selection was given to underachieving pupils not served by Chapter 1 programs. Second priority for selection was at the option of the classroom teacher to include underachievers who were also being served in other compensatory education programs.

Pupils who attended 80% (93) of the program days for the time interval which ended March 28, 1991, or were discontinued, had valid pretest and posttest scores, and were English speaking, (for Objective 1) comprised the evaluation sample. The attendance criterion was met by 782 (48.8%) of the pupils served (1603); of those who received both administrations of the achievement test, 723 pupils had a valid pretest and posttest score. Data from testing are presented in Tables 9-11.

First grade pupils were administered the Reading subtest of the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Level Preprimer, Form L in the fall and Level Primer, Form L (MAT6, 1985) in the Spring. Analyses were based on a comparison of the Total Reading score for each level of the test administered.

Analyses of pretest-posttest change scores of raw scores, percentiles, and normal curve equivalents (NCEs) were conducted. For the reader who is interested in the pre-and-posttest results for the number of correct responses and for percentile statistics, tables are included in Appendix C, Tables C-3 and C-4, page 46.

Although the results for the number of correct responses and for percentile statistics are available in the appendixes, the reader should be wary of trying to extrapolate these results into comparisons of pupils achievement. Raw scores are equal units of measurement, but can only provide a limited interpretation of achievement data. Percentiles provide comparative information but are not equal units of measure. Caution is advised in drawing conclusions about program impact from any of the scores above. Normal curve equivalents (NCEs) are generally considered to provide the truest indication of pupil growth in achievement, since they provide comparative information in equal units of measurement. Data for normal curve equivalents for the total reading skills tested are presented in Tables 10 and 11.

The average pretest NCE score was 23.1 and 30.5 on the posttest. The overall NCE gain for the program averaged 7.3 points on the Total Reading test (see Table 10).

Table 9
Number of Pupils Served, Averages for Days Scheduled, Days Served,
Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week, and
Pupils Attending 80% of Days
Reported for Grade 1
1990-91

| Pupils Served | Girls | Boys | Average Days Scheduled | Average Days Served | Average Daily Membership | Average Hours of Instruction Per Pupil Per Week |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1603 | 696 | 907 | 109.5 | 95.9 | 1290.7 | 2.6 |

Table 10
Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Total
Reading Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE)
Reported for Grade 1
1990-91

| Grade | Number of Pupils | Pretest Min. | Pretest Max. | Pretest Average NCE | Pretest Standard Deviation | Posttest Min. | Posttest Max. | Posttest Average NCE | Posttest Standard Deviation | Average Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 723 | 1.0 | 70.9 | 23.1 | 17.2 | 1.0 | 99.0 | 30.5 | 23.2 | 7.3 |

Table 11
Number and Percent of Pupils in Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE)
Score Improvement Change Categories in the Total Reading Test
for First Grade Pupils
1990-91

| Test | Pupils in Sample | No Improvement ( < 0.5 ) | | Some Improvement (0.5 to 2.9) | | Substantial Improvement (3.0 or more) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Total Reading | 723 | 318 | 43.9 | 22 | 3.0 | 383 | 52.9 |

Table 11 contains Total Reading test data related to changes in NCE scores for three ranges: (a) no improvement in NCE scores (< 0.5); (b) some improvement in NCE scores (0.5 to 2.9); and (c) substantial improvement in NCE scores (3.0 or more). The Total Reading test data indicated that 405 (55.9%) pupils made gains in NCE scores. More specifically, 383 (52.9%) made substantial improvement and 22 (3.0%) made some improvement in NCE scores, while 318 (43.9%) made no improvement. The first evaluation objective set a goal that 50 percent of the sample pupils would gain 3.0 NCE points for the instructional period in Total Reading. The evaluation objective was met with 52.9% of the pupils gaining 3.0 NCE points or more for the instructional period.

The second objective stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period (which ended May 3, 1991) or who were discontinued would demonstrate satisfactory progress in the regular classroom as demonstrated by promotion to the next grade level. Information regarding promotion was obtained from the district's Student Master File (SMF) in June for 773 program pupils. The data indicated 662 (85.6%) of the pupils served during the program year were promoted; 111 (14.2%) pupils were not promoted. The results indicated that the evaluation objective (2.0) was achieved. The information collected is summarized in Table 12.

Table 12

The Number and Percent of Program Pupils Who Were Promoted/Not Promoted to the Next Grade Level

| Program Pupils | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Promoted | 662 | 85.6 |
| Not Promoted | 111 | 14.4 |
| Total | 773 | 100.0 |

Objective 3.0 stated that, given the service of a half time instructional assistant in the classroom, 80 percent of the teachers would observe that pupils receiving instructional assistance by the assistant would improve significantly in reading and language arts as a direct result of that service. In May, the teachers participating in the program were surveyed to evaluate their perceptions of the impact of the services of the assistants on first grade pupils' reading skills. Of the 175 teachers, 136 (76.0%) returned

the survey. The first part of the survey asked the teachers to respond to eight statements concerning the performance of the instructional assistant as well as the adequacy of the test instrument administered. The second part of the survey asked the teachers to respond to 11 statements concerning the degree of progress by target pupils which could be attributed to the efforts of the instructional assistant. Part 3 of the survey asked teachers to indicate the number of pupils retained, the number that might have been retained this year because of reading deficiencies were it not for the services of the instructional assistant, and the number of non-target group pupils retained. The teachers responded to the items in Part 1 and 2 by using a 5-point rating scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree (see p. 40-41, Appendix B). Tables 13, 14, and 15 summarize responses to the three parts of the survey.

The teachers' agreement with item 1 (84.5%) is an indication that Criterion 3.1 specified in Objective 3.0 was achieved (see Table 13). Not only was the criterion achieved as indicated by teacher ratings, but normative data also indicated pupil achievement occurred as anticipated.

Of the teachers responding to item 6, 43.4% (59) indicated that the MAT6 Test was an accurate measure of pupil achievement; 27.2% (37) teachers were undecided and 29.4% (40) believed the test was not an accurate measure. It should be noted the MAT6 was selected for use during the 1989-90 school year. At the time it was considered by the Division of Elementary Schools to be the best test for first grade which matched the districts Course of Study and fulfilled other informational needs. The test was required by the Reading Recovery Program and consequently perceived to be appropriate for all first grade testing within the district. Responses to item 7 indicated that test instructions were adequate. Responses to item 8 indicated that most teachers felt that the time allotted for testing was adequate. Response to item 4 indicated that the Resource Guide and Handbook's value was not perceived to be as helpful as anticipated.

Overall, 81.1% of the teachers attributed pupil progress to the instructional assistant as indicated by positive ratings of the 11 skill areas listed in Table 14. The average rating was 4.0 on a 5-point rating scale.

Teacher responses to Part 3 of the survey, Table 15, indicated that 253 pupils were retained this year and that a total of 301 additional pupils might have been retained this year because of reading deficiencies were it not for the services of the instructional assistant as judged by those teachers responding. Fifty-five non-target group pupils were retained this year.

The data indicated Criterion 3.1 specified in Objective 3.0 was achieved. However, teacher ratings (using a 5-point rating scale) highlighted areas of concern. The areas of concern, which were indicated by more than 20 percent of the responding teachers, were the perceived inadequacies of the MAT6 as an accurate measure of pupil achievement (3.1) and the inadequacy of the value of the Resource Guide and Handbook to assistants in helping pupils (3.8). Teacher ratings also indicated instructional assistants did not adequately assist pupils to write one or more complete sentences (3.9) or to recognize key words and understand concepts introduced in the Houghton-Mifflin reading series (3.8).

The fourth objective stated that meaningful training sessions would be provided for participants regarding materials and skills necessary to perform the stated tasks of the instructional assistants as specified in Criterion 4.1 and Criterion 4.2 (see p. 2). In May 1991, the Instructional Assessment

Table 13
Average Response and Percent of Responses for
Part 1 of the Classroom
Teacher Survey (First Grade)

| Item | Number Responding | Average Response | Percent SD (1) | D (2) | U (3) | A (4) | SA (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The overall reading and language arts abilities of pupils in the target group improved significantly as a result of interacting with the instructional assistant. | 136 | 4.0 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 2.9 | 48.5 | 36.0 |
| 2. The instructional materials made by the assistant were useful in working with children. | 136 | 4.2 | 5.1 | 3.7 | 4.4 | 37.5 | 49.3 |
| 3. The instructional assistant has a basic understanding of how beginning reading and language arts are taught. | 136 | 4.2 | 5.1 | 2.9 | 4.4 | 40.4 | 47.1 |
| 4. The Resource Guide and Handbook developed for the program has been of great value to the instructional assistant in helping pupils. | 128 | 3.8 | 6.3 | 5.5 | 19.5 | 39.8 | 28.9 |
| 5. During reading and language arts activities, the instructional assistant relates well to the pupils. | 136 | 4.4 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 5.1 | 28.7 | 60.3 |
| 6. The MAT6 test instrument seemed to be an adequate measure of pupil achievement. | 136 | 3.1 | 12.5 | 16.9 | 27.2 | 35.3 | 8.1 |
| 7. The instructions given to complete the MAT6 testing process were adequate. | 136 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 5.1 | 66.9 | 24.3 |
| 8. The time allotted for testing was adequate. | 136 | 3.9 | 2.2 | 5.1 | 7.4 | 65.4 | 19.9 |

Note. Ratings were based on the following scale: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

Table 14
Average Response and Percent of Responses for
Part 2 of the Classroom
Teacher Survey (First Grade)

| Items | Number Responding | Average Response | Percent SD (1) | D (2) | U (3) | A (4) | SA (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Relate and share experiences and stories in correct sequence | 136 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 5.9 | 9.6 | 58.1 | 22.1 |
| 2. Recognize lower and upper case alphabet letters | 136 | 4.2 | 2.2 | 4.4 | 7.4 | 39.0 | 47.1 |
| 3. Write numerals correctly | 136 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 8.1 | 8.8 | 43.4 | 37.5 |
| 4. Form and space letters and words correctly | 135 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 5.2 | 6.7 | 48.9 | 36.3 |
| 5. Write one or more complete sentences | 135 | 3.9 | 5.2 | 5.9 | 11.1 | 49.6 | 28.1 |
| 6. Match words with pictures | 136 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 9.6 | 47.1 | 36.0 |
| 7. Recognize that words may name people, places, animals, and things | 136 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 3.7 | 11.0 | 49.3 | 31.6 |
| 8. Recall details in stories | 136 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 5.9 | 7.4 | 56.6 | 26.5 |
| 9. Read familiar groups of words or sentences accurately | 136 | 3.9 | 2.2 | 4.4 | 11.8 | 55.9 | 25.7 |
| 10. Listen and respond to stories, poems, plays, and other literary forms | 136 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 5.1 | 8.1 | 49.3 | 33.8 |
| 11. Recognize key words and understand concepts introduced in the Houghton-Mifflin reading series | 134 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 5.2 | 13.4 | 58.2 | 19.4 |

Note. Ratings were based on the following scale: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

Table 15
Number of Responses to Part 3 of the
Classroom Teacher Survey (First Grade)

| Item | Number of Teachers | Number of Pupils |
|---|---|---|
| 1. How many Instructional Assistant Program pupils are you retaining this year because of reading deficiencies? | 136 | 253 |
| 2. How many Instructional Assistant Program target pupils might you have retained because of reading deficiencies, were it not for the services of the instructional assistant? | 136 | 301 |
| 3. How many non-target group pupils are you retaining this year? | 135 | 55 |

Instrument was sent to the first grade instructional assistants. The purpose of this instrument (see pp.42-43, Appendix B) was to assess the value of the inservice after the assistants had an opportunity to apply the inservice training and materials in the classroom. The assistants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with 12 statements using a 5-point rating scale. The instrument was returned by 105 (87.5%) of 120 assistants surveyed.

The results regarding Objective 4.0 (Criterion 4.1) were combined for kindergarten and first grade. The evaluation instrument was revised by a supervisor outside the Department of Program Evaluation. Consequently, the data could not be disaggregated by grade level (kindergarten and grade 1). The reader is directed to the Kindergarten Component-Major Findings (see p. 11-12) for presentation of these results. The data indicated Objective 4.0 as specified in Criterion 4.1 was attained.

The evidence outlined in Table 16 shows that Criterion 4.2 of Objective 4.0 was met. Overall, 91.5% of the instructional assistants rated that the content of the inservice training sessions as being helpful in the classroom setting. Ratings indicated that assistants perceived the content of the inservice meetings were helpful in the classroom and enhanced their understanding of the teachers' reading/language arts responsibilities. While assistants' ratings were more positive than anticipated, they did highlight one area of possible concern (i.e., the inadequacy of the Resource Guide and Handbook for use on a weekly basis).

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor record keeping procedures of kindergarten and first grade assistants at two points in time, October, 1990 and March, 1991. The Calendar Worksheet, implemented during the 1990-91 school year, was designed to document the days of pupil program service (see p. 38, Appendix B). Each assistant was asked to send copies of the Calendar Worksheet for a randomly selected group of program pupils to the program evaluator by October 30, 1990. Worksheets were reviewed to see if they were properly coded; those in error were corrected by phone or a short note. Needed information was supplied to those assistants having additional concerns. Calendar Worksheets were generally found to be in compliance with evaluation guidelines.

Table 16
Average Response and Percent of Responses for the
Instructional Assessment Instrument (First Grade)

| Item | Number Responding | Average Response | Percent SD (1) | D (2) | U (3) | A (4) | SA (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. As a result of the in-service training sessions, I have a greater understanding of how first graders learn to read. | 102 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 47.1 | 49.0 |
| 2. The inservice training sessions have helped me to effectively participate in a first grade classroom. | 102 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 |
| 3. As a result of the inservice training sessions, I have a greater understanding of the concerns and responsibilities that a first grade teacher has toward the instruction of reading and language arts. | 101 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 44.6 | 51.5 |
| 4. The topics presented in the inservice training sessions were helpful to me in understanding my role in the classroom. | 102 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 3.9 | 50.0 | 45.1 |
| 5. I understand how the Houghton Mifflin reading series is to be used at the first grade level. | 102 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 11.8 | 60.8 | 25.5 |

(table continues)

Table 16 (continued)
Average Response and Percent of Responses for the
Instructional Assessment Instrument (First Grade)

| Item | Number Responding | Average Response | Percent SD (1) | D (2) | U (3) | A (4) | SA (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. During the inservice training sessions, I learned many activities and instructional methods which may be used in the teaching of reading and language arts with first grade pupils. | 101 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 49.5 | 46.5 |
| 7. These inservice sessions have made me aware of the instructional resources made available by our school system. | 101 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 58.4 | 34.7 |
| 8. After the inservice training session, I felt prepared to help children develop and use reading and language arts skills. | 102 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 52.0 | 42.2 |
| 9. I shared information from the inservice training sessions with the first grade teacher(s) to whom I am assigned. | 103 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 51.5 | 42.7 |
| 10. The teacher(s) I work with has shared ideas and shown me ways to become better at helping pupils develop and use reading and language arts skills. | 104 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 7.7 | 2.9 | 42.3 | 46.2 |
| 11. I used the Resource Guide and Handbook on at least a weekly basis. | 105 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 14.3 | 4.8 | 55.2 | 21.9 |
| 12. The Resource Guide and Handbook was very useful to me in the instruction of reading and language arts skills. | 105 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 5.7 | 7.6 | 55.2 | 30.5 |

Note. Ratings were based on the following scale: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

In March, 1991 the program evaluator visited a randomly selected group of program assistants to review records. More specifically, the purpose of these visits was to review record keeping documents and to insure that they were properly coded, kept up-to-date, and that there were records for every pupil served -- even if served for only one day. There were 22 assistants (10.9%) of the 202 kindergarten and first grade assistants visited. Visits were made to 14 buildings during the period from March 19 to March 28, 1991. It was assumed those selected for visitation were representative of the program staff.

The data indicated no major problems regarding the documents reviewed for those assistants visited. However, two assistants did have special needs which required more than one visit to assure that records were appropriately coded.

## Summary

For evaluation purposes, the Instructional Assistant Program started September 24, for first grade and October 1, 1990 for kindergarten. For evaluation based on standardized test data the time interval ended March 28, 1991. An additional 20 scheduled days (through May 3, 1991) were included in the time interval for evaluation of objectives not based on standardized test data.

The two time intervals allowed for data to be available for pupils served during the year to be reported in terms of treatment groups and evaluation samples. Treatment group refers to those pupils who met the attendance criteria (80%) or had been discontinued (grade 1 only). A pupil could be in two treatment groups. The first group was comprised of those who met the attendance criteria for the time interval from September 24 (first grade) or October 1, 1990 (kindergarten) to March 28, 1991. The second treatment group included those pupils who met the attendance criteria (80%) for the time interval from September 24, 1990 (first grade) or October 1, 1990 (kindergarten) to May 3, 1991.

Program pupils could be included in one or two evaluation samples. Kindergarten pupils could be in two evaluation samples. One group was comprised of kindergarten pupils who were in the treatment group, considered to be English speaking by their program teacher/assistant, and had valid Total Reading pretest and posttest scores. The second group was comprised of kindergarten pupils who were in the treatment group, considered to be English speaking by their program teacher/assistant, and had valid Oral Comprehension pretest and posttest scores. The one evaluation sample for first grade was comprised of pupils who were in the treatment group, considered to be English speaking by their program teacher/assistant, and had valid Total Reading pretest and posttest scores.

The term discontinued referred to first grade pupils (only) who met program criteria for termination of service and no longer needed the services of the instructional assistant. The procedure and criteria for discontinuance were generated and managed by Federal and State Programs.

The kindergarten and first grade components of the Instructional Assistant Program provided educational support for pupils who were underachievers. Instructional assistants were trained to provide direct instructional service to selected pupils in the classroom setting. The kindergarten component was conducted in 14 schools with an equivalent of 23.5 assistants serving 445 pupils and 27 teachers; the first grade component was conducted in 57 schools with the equivalent of 85 assistants serving 1,603 pupils and 175 teachers.

Kindergarten Component

The evaluation of the kindergarten component was accomplished through the analysis of four program objectives, through the administering of pretests and posttests, surveys, and process evaluation.

Objectives 1.0 and 2.0 called for evidence of pupil improvement by at least 3.0 NCE points in Total Reading and Oral Comprehension, respectively, by 50% of the evaluation sample pupils. The data indicated improvements of 3.0 NCE points or more by 67.1% (94) of the sample on Total Reading and 67.9% (95) on Oral Comprehension. Objectives 1.0 and 2.0 were achieved.

Objective 3.0 stated that, given the service of a half time instructional assistant in the classroom, 80 percent of the kindergarten teachers will perceive that pupils receiving instructional assistance by the assistant will improve significantly in reading and language arts as a direct result of that service. Teachers were surveyed in the spring to assess their perceptions regarding the services rendered by the instructional assistant. Of the 27 teachers surveyed, 15 (55.6%) returned the survey. The first part of the survey asked the teachers to respond to eight statements concerning the performance of the instructional assistant as well as the adequacy of the CTBS testing instrument. The second part of the survey asked the teachers to respond to 11 statements concerning the degree of progress by target pupils which could be attributed to the efforts of the instructional assistant. The third part of the survey asked teachers to indicate the number of pupils retained, the number that might have been retained were it not for the services of the instructional assistant, and the number of non-target group pupils retained. The teachers responded to the items in Part 1 and 2 using a 5-point rating scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

The data indicated 78.6% (11) of the teacher ratings agreed that pupil success was attributable to the services of the instructional assistant. Objective 3.0 was not attained.

Classroom teacher ratings (using a 5-point rating scale) highlighted areas of concern, among which were the perceived inadequacies of the CTBS as an accurate measure of reading readiness (2.1), the inadequacy of the time allotted for testing (3.1), and the inadequacy of instructions given to complete the CTBS testing process (3.7). Teacher ratings also indicated instructional assistants did not adequately assist pupils to help them know the sounds of single consonants (3.7), match words to pictures (3.8), be able to read familiar sentences (3.9), or recognize the ten basic words from the Houghton Mifflin Reading series (3.7).

Objective 4.0 stated that meaningful training sessions were to be provided for participants regarding materials and skills necessary to perform the stated tasks of the instructional assistant while Criterion 4.1 required that 80% of the participants would perceive that each training session was meaningful. During the year, 15 inservice sessions were provided for the kindergarten and first grade instructional assistants. The evaluation instrument was revised by a supervisor outside of the Department of Program Evaluation. Consequently, the data could not be disaggregated by grade level (kindergarten and grade 1). Inservice evaluation forms were distributed at the end of each session to rate the value of the content. The evidence shows that kindergarten and grade 1 assistants perceived the inservice sessions to be informative (99.6%), interesting (99.1%), and worthwhile (98.9%). Thus, Criterion 4.1 was achieved.

Criterion 4.2 called for 80% of the participants to perceive that the content of the training sessions would be helpful in the classroom. Overall, 97.3% kindergarten assistants agreed that the content of the sessions was helpful in the classroom. Thus Criterion 4.2, as specified in Objective 4.0 for kindergarten, was achieved. The achievement of Criterion 4.1 and 4.2 indicate Objective 4.0 was attained.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor record keeping procedures of kindergarten and first grade assistants; the evaluation results can be found in the first grade summary (see p. 28).

First Grade Component

The evaluation of the first grade component was accomplished through the analysis of four program objectives, through the administering of pretests and posttests, surveys, and process evaluation.

Objective 1.0 called for evidence of pupil improvement of at least 3.0 NCE points in Total Reading by 50% of the pupils in the evaluation sample. The objective was achieved by 52.9% (383) of the evaluation sample, with 55.9% (405) overall showing some improvement during the instructional period. Objective 1.0 was achieved.

Objective 2.0 called for 50% of the pupils in the treatment group to be promoted to the next grade level in June. Information regarding promotion was obtained from the districts Student Master File (SMF) in June for 773 pupils in the treatment group. Of this number, the data indicated 85.6% (663) were promoted. Thus, Objective 2.0 was achieved.

Objective 3.0 stated that, given the service of a half time instructional assistant in the classroom, 80 percent of the first grade teachers would observe that pupils receiving instructional assistance by the assistant would improve significantly in reading and language arts as a direct result of that service. In May, the teachers participating in the program were surveyed to evaluate their perceptions of the impact of the services of the assistants on first grade pupils' reading skills. Of the 175 teachers, 136 (76.0%) returned the survey. The first part of the survey asked the teachers to respond to eight statements concerning the performance of the instructional assistant as well as the adequacy of the test instrument administered. The second part of the survey asked the teachers to respond to 11 statements concerning the degree of progress by target pupils which could be attributed to the efforts of the instructional assistant. Part 3 of the survey asked teachers to indicate the number of pupils retained, the number that might have been retained this year because of reading deficiencies were it not for the services of the instructional assistant, and the number of non-target group pupils retained. The teachers responded to the items in Part 1 and 2 by using a 5-point rating scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

The data indicated 84.5% (115) of the teacher ratings agreed that pupil success was attributable to the services of the instructional assistant. Objective 3.0 was achieved.

Classroom teacher ratings (using a 5-point rating scale) highlighted areas of concern. The areas of concern, which were indicated by more than 20 percent of the responding teachers, were the perceived inadequacies of the MAT6 as an accurate measure of pupil achievement (3.1) and the inadequacy of the value of the Resource Guide and Handbook to assistants in helping pupils (3.8). Teacher

ratings also indicated instructional assistants did not adequately assist pupils to write one or more complete sentences (3.9) or to recognize key words and understand concepts introduced in the reading series (3.8).

The reader is directed to the Kindergarten Component Summary, p. 26, for a discussion of Objective 4.0, Criterion 4.1 (kindergarten and grade 1). Criterion 4.2 (grade 1) called for 80% of the participants to perceive that the content of the training sessions would be helpful in the classroom. Overall, 91.5% first grade assistants agreed that the content of the sessions was helpful in the classroom. Thus Criterion 4.2 was achieved. Objective 4.0, regarding Criterion 4.1 and 4.2, was attained.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor record keeping procedures of kindergarten and first grade assistants at two points in time, October, 1990 and March, 1991. Each assistant was asked to send copies of the Calendar Worksheet for a randomly selected group of pupils to the program evaluator by October 30, 1990. Worksheets were reviewed to see if they were properly coded. Calendar Worksheets were generally found to be in compliance with evaluation guidelines.

A randomly selected group of program assistants were visited in March, 1991 by the program evaluator to review records. There were 22 assistants (10.9%) of the 202 kindergarten and first grade assistants visited. The data indicated no major problems regarding the documents reviewed for those assistants visited. However, two assistants did have special needs which required more than one visit to enhance the record keeping process.

## Recommendations

Based on the evaluation results, it is strongly recommended that the Instructional Assistants Program be continued in the 1991-92 school year. The following recommendations are made to enhance program success:

1. Provide an inservice program for assistants to broaden the base of instructional skills as highlighted by the concerns reflected in the surveys of the kindergarten and first grade component personnel. In addition, a major focus of the inservice program should be to improve those skills needed to enhance the newly adopted (language based) reading series.
2. Provide at least one team inservice meeting for teachers and assistants to broaden the understanding of their roles and responsibilities in regards to instructional objectives and program goals, especially in the areas of improving reading and language arts as appropriate at both grade levels. Emphasis should be placed on joint planning, communication, cooperation, and awareness of and understanding norm reference tests and their function.
3. When and wherever possible, the program evaluator should increase program classroom visitations to ascertain the degree of evaluation compliance and to address the concerns of assistants.
4. From visitation and discussion with project personnel, there were probably more pupils served during the 1990-91 school year than the data indicate. There is a need for more accurate accounting. Whenever possible, the project evaluator should be provided the opportunity to reacquaint assistants with appropriate evaluation procedures at the close of inservice meetings. More input by the program evaluator should enhance data collection.

## References

CTB/McGraw-Hill Staffwriters. (1981). Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

# Appendix A

## Kindergarten Component

Columbus Public Schools
DPPF Instructional Assistant Program
ORIENTATION EVALUATION FORM

September __, 1990

Please check ( ) one in each column:

| Component | | Years of Experience in Inst. Assistant Prog. |
|---|---|---|
| ___Kdgn. | ___Principal | ___(1st Year) |
| ___1st Grade | ___Teacher | ___(2nd Year) |
| ___Other (specify) | ___Instruc. Assistant | ___(3rd Year) |
| _____ | ___Other (specify) | ___More |
| | _____ | |

Instructions: Answer the question below by putting a check ( ) in the space that best shows your opinion.

1. The content presented at today's session was:

   a. very informative ___
      informative ___
      not informative ___

   b. very interesting ___
      interesting ___
      not very interesting ___

   c. very worthwhile ___
      worthwhile ___
      not worthwhile ___

2. Was the length of the session adequate for presentation of the subject area(s)?

   Yes____ No____ Explain_____

   _____

3. Was there sufficient opportunity for questions and answers?

   Yes____ No____ Explain_____

4. Were questions answered? Yes____ No____ Explain_____

   _____

5. What changes do you suggest for improving today's session?_____

   _____

6. What subject areas do you recommend for future sessions?_____

   _____



EVALSRVCS/P518/RPTFAID91
03/18/92

Columbus Public Schools
DPPF Instructional Assistant Program
1990-91
INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM TRAINING SURVEY

Date: _____
|_|_|_|_|_|_| (month, day, year)

Component: _____Kdg. ____1st Grade

Subject Area(s)_____

Presenter(s)_____

Please check ( ) one:
___Principal
___Teacher
___Instructional Assistant

Please check ( ) one:
Years of Experience in the Inst. Assistant Program
___(1st Year)
___(2nd Year)
___(3rd Year)
___(More)

Instructions: Answer the question below by putting a check ( ) in the space that best shows your opinion.

1. The content presented at today's session was:

   a. very informative ____
      informative ____
      not informative ____

   b. very interesting ____
      interesting ____
      not very interesting ____

   c. very worthwhile ____
      worthwhile ____
      not worthwhile ____

2. Was the length of the session adequate for presentation of the subject area?

   Yes____ No____ Explain_____

_____

3. Was there sufficient opportunity for questions and answers?

   Yes____ No____ Explain_____

4. Were questions answered? Yes____ No____ Explain_____

_____

5. What changes do you suggest for improving today's session?_____

_____

6. What subject areas do you recommend for future sessions?_____

_____



EVALSRVCS/P518/RPTFAID91
03/18/92

Columbus Public Schools
Instructional Assistant Program (Kindergarten)
1990-91

CLASSROOM TEACHER SURVEY

The Classroom Teacher Survey of the Instructional Assistant Program is designed to evaluate your perceptions of the overall aide program. Please complete the following survey and return it by school mail no later than May 13, 1991. Thank you.

Part 1. Listed below are statements regarding the Instructional Assistant Program. Please circle the one response that best describes your feelings about each statement. Responses are (SA) Strongly Agree, (A) Agree, (U) are Undecided, (D) Disagree or (SD) Strongly Disagree.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The overall readiness to read of pupils in the target group has improved significantly as a direct result of interacting with the instructional assistant. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. The instructional materials made by the assistant were useful in working with children. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. The instructional assistant has a basic understanding of how kindergarten pupils begin to read. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. The Resource Guide and Handbook developed for the program has been of great value to the assistant in helping pupils. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. During readiness activities, the instructional assistant relates well to the pupils. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. The CTBS instrument seemed to be an adequate measure of reading readiness. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. The instructions given to complete the CTBS testing process were adequate. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. The time allotted for testing was adequate. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

Part 2. Please indicate the degree to which progress was experienced by target group pupils in reading and language arts which can be attributed to the efforts of the instructional assistant. Please circle the one response that best describes your feelings about each statement. Responses are (SA) Strongly Agree, (A) Agree, (U) are Undecided, (D) Disagree or (SD) Strongly Disagree.

As the result of the efforts of the instructional assistant, target group pupils are better able to:

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Relate and share experiences and stories in correct sequence | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. | Recognize the letters of the alphabet | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. | Write their names and numbers (1-20) | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. | Deliver oral messages correctly | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. | Listen and respond to stories, poems, plays and other literary forms | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. | Recall details and stories | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. | Differentiate colors, shapes, sizes, facts and fantasies | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. | Know the sounds of single consonants | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 9. | Match words to pictures | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 10. | Read familiar sentences | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 11. | Recognize the 10 basic words introduced in the Houghton-Mifflin-series | SA | A | U | D | SD |

Part 3. Listed below are questions regarding the impact of the instructional assistant on the progress of target pupils. Please indicate your response by recording the appropriate number.

1. How many <u>instructional assistant program target pupils</u> are you retaining this year because of reading deficiencies?_____

2. How many additional <u>instructional assistant program target pupils might you have retained</u>, because of reading deficiencies, were it not for the services of the instructional assistant? _____

3. How many non-target group pupils are you retaining this year? _____

Columbus Public Schools
Instructional Assistant Program (Kindergarten)
1990-91

INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANT ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

The Instructional Assistant Assessment of the Kindergarten Instructional Assistant Program is designed to evaluate your perceptions of this program. Please complete the following assessment and return it by school mail no later than May 13, 1991. Thank you.

Part 1. Please respond to the following statements by circling one response which best indicates whether you (SA) Strongly Agree, (A) Agree, (U) are Undecided, (D) Disagree, or (SD) Strongly Disagree with each statement.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | As a result of the inservice training sessions, I have a greater understanding of how kindergarteners get ready to read. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. | The inservice training sessions helped me to effectively participate in a kindergarten classroom. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. | As a result of the inservice training sessions, I have a better understanding of the concerns and responsibilities that a kindergarten teacher has toward the instruction of beginning reading. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. | The topics presented in the inservice training sessions were helpful to me in understanding my role in the classroom. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. | I understand how the Houghton-Mifflin reading series is to be used at the kindergarten level. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. | During the inservice training sessions, I learned many activities and instructional methods which may be used in the instruction of reading with kindergarten pupils. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. | These inservice sessions made me aware of the instructional resources made available by our school system. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. | After the inservice training session, I felt prepared to help children in learning to read. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | I shared information from the in-service training sessions with the kindergarten teacher(s) to whom I am assigned. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 10. | The teacher(s) I work with has shared ideas and shown me ways to become better at helping pupils learn to read. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 11. | I used the Resource Guide and Handbook on at least a weekly basis. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 12. | The Resource Guide and Handbook was very useful to me in the instruction of reading and language arts skills. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

Part 2. As required by the Department of Education, for the State of Ohio, please indicate below the AVERAGE number of sessions you work with target students per week; the AVERAGE number of students, where appropriate, and number of minutes per session. A session is defined as a block of time in which you provide direct service to target pupils, individually or in a small group. The calculation of the average number of sessions and average number of minutes pupils are served is based upon a typical week in which instruction was provided by the categories listed below.

| | AVERAGE | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Sessions Per Week | Number of Students Per Session | Number of Minutes Per Session |
| 1. Individualized Instruction | | | |
| a. Writing Skills | _____ | N/A | _____ |
| b. Reading | _____ | N/A | _____ |
| 2. Small Group Instruction | | | |
| a. Writing Skills | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. Reading | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Appendix B

First Grade Component

* CALENDAR WORKSHEET FOR RECORDING DAYS OF PUPIL SERVICE *
1990-91

Student's Name _____

Student's Birthdate _ _ _ _ _ _
M M D D Y Y

Student Number _ _ _ _ _ _

Race Code _____ (1-5)

Sex _____ (M or F)

Note: Please keep original worksheets for all pupils (even for pupils who leave). Do not send to program coordinator or to other schools.

Teacher Name _____

Program Code _ _ _ _ _

School _____

School Code _ _ _

| 1990-91 | M | T | W | TH | F | M | T | W | TH | F | M | T | W | TH | F | M | T | W | TH | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aug. 27 - Sept. 21 | M | M | 29 | 30 | 31 | H | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Sept. 24 - Oct. 19 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | COTA |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Oct. 22 - Nov. 16 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | PC |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Nov. 19 - Dec. 14 | 19 | 20 | 21 | H | N | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| | | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dec. 17 - Jan. 18 | 17 | 18 | 19 | N | N | N | N | N | 3 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jan. 21 - Feb. 15 | H | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | PC |
| | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Feb. 18 - Mar. 15 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| Mar. 18 - Apr. 12 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | N | N | N | N | N | N | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Apr. 15 - May 10 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 29 | 30 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| May 13 - June 7 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | H | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | R |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

OFFICIAL FIRST DAY OF ENROLLMENT FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS:

Consulting Teacher Programs Sept. 17th
Early Literacy 2 Sept. 17th
Non-Public 2-8 Sept. 17th
N or D 2-12 Sept. 17th
Early Literacy 1 Sept. 24th
Non-Public 1 Sept. 24th
N or D 1 Sept. 24th
Instructional Assistant 1 Sept. 24th
Instructional Assistant K Oct. 1st
All Day Kindergarten Oct. 1st
Full Day Kindergarten Oct. 1st

RACE CODES
1 = Non-Minority
2 = Black
3 = Spanish Surname
4 = Asian American
5 = American Indian

SERVICE CODES
0 = Pupil Not Scheduled (Inservice, Teacher Illness, Personal Day, Snow Day, Parent Conference Day, etc.)
1 = Pupil Scheduled and Not Served (Absent from School/Class)
2 = Pupil Served (Pupil Present)



EVALSRVCS/P518/RPTFAID91
03/18/92

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
PUPIL DATA SHEET

SCHOOL CODE |_|_|_|_| PROGRAM CODE |_|_|_|_|_|_| SSN |_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

School Name _____ Program Name _____ Teacher Name _____

1. |_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_| |_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_| |_|_|
Student: Last Name First Name M.I.

2. STUDENT NO. |_|_|_|_|_|_|_| GRADE |_|_| BIRTHDATE |_|_|_|_|_|_|
m m d d y y

3. Is This Pupil English Speaking? NO YES

4. Pupil Progress: NONE SOME MUCH

5. Hours Per Week of Instruction |_|_|_|.|_|

6. Pupil Was Discontinued NO YES 92001, 92002, 92007, 92060, 92104

7. Parent Helped With Homework NO YES 92007, 92017, 92060

8. Parent Reads to Child or Child Reads to Parent NO YES 92007, 92017, 92060

FOR QUESTIONS 6-8, CIRCLE NO, YES, OR YOUR PROGRAM CODE IF IT IS LISTED. (SEE PROGRAM CODE ON PREPRINTED FORMS.)

For numbers 9-13, fill in the number of parents involved in each activity during the year and cumulative hours of contact.

| | | No. of Parents | No. of Hours |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | Planning | |_|_| | |_|_|_|_|.|_|_| |
| 10. | Group Meetings | |_|_| | |_|_|_|_|.|_|_| |
| 11. | Individual Conferences | |_|_| | |_|_|_|_|.|_|_| |
| 12. | Classroom Visits | |_|_| | |_|_|_|_|.|_|_| |
| 13. | Home Visits | |_|_| | |_|_|_|_|.|_|_| |

| | | thru 04-03-92 | from 04-06-92 thru 05-01-92 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | Number of Days Service Scheduled (Carefully Read Instructions) | |_|_|_|_| | |_|_|_|_| |
| 15. | Number of Days Service Received (Carefully Read Instructions) | |_|_|_|_| | |_|_|_|_| |



EVALSRVCS/P518/RPTFAID91

Columbus Public Schools
Instructional Assistant Program (First Grade)
1990-91

CLASSROOM TEACHER SURVEY

The Classroom Teacher Survey of the Instructional Assistant Program is designed to evaluate your perceptions of the overall assistant program. Please complete the following survey and **return it by school mail no later than May 13, 1991.** Thank you.

Part 1. Listed below are statements regarding the Instructional Assistant Program. Please circle the one response that best describes your feelings about each statement. Responses are (SA) Strongly Agree, (A) Agree, (U) are Undecided, (D) Disagree or (SD) Strongly Disagree.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The overall reading and language arts abilities of pupils in the target group improved significantly as a result of interacting with the instructional assistant. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. The instructional materials made by the assistant were useful in working with children. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. The instructional assistant has a basic understanding of how beginning reading and language arts are taught. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. The Resource Guide and Handbook developed for the program has been of great value to the instructional assistant in helping pupils. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. During reading and language arts activities, the instructional assistant relates well to the pupils. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. The MAT6 instrument seemed to be an adequate measure of pupil achievement. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. The instructions given to complete the MAT6 testing process were adequate. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. The time allotted for testing was adequate. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

Part 2. Please indicate the degree to which progress was experienced by target group pupils in reading and language arts which can be attributed to the efforts of the instructional assistant. Please circle the one response that best describes your feelings about each statement. Responses are (SA) Strongly Agree, (A) Agree, (U) are Undecided, (D) Disagree or (SD) Strongly Disagree.

As the result of the efforts of the instructional assistant, target group pupils are better able to:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Relate and share experiences and stories in correct sequence | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. Recognize lower and upper case alphabet letters | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. Write numerals correctly | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. Form and space letters and words correctly | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. Write one or more complete sentences | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. Match words with pictures | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. Recognize that words may name people, places, animals, and things | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. Recall details in stories | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 9. Read familiar groups of words or sentences accurately | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 10. Listen and respond to stories, poems, plays, and other literary forms | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 11. Recognize key words and understand concepts introduced in the Houghton-Mifflin reading series | SA | A | U | D | SD |

Part 3. Listed below are questions regarding the impact of the instructional assistant on the progress of target pupils. Please indicate your response by recording the appropriate number.

1 How many instructional assistant program target pupils are you retaining this year because of reading deficiencies? _____

2. How many additional instructional assistant program target pupils might you have retained, because of reading deficiencies, were it not for the services of the instructional assistant? _____

3. How many non-target group pupils are you retaining this year?_____

Columbus Public Schools
Instructional Assistant Program (First Grade)
1990-91

INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANT ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

The Instructional Assistant Assessment of the First Grade Instructional Assistant Program is designed to evaluate your perceptions of this program. Please complete the following assessment and return it by school mail no later than May 13, 1991. Thank you.

Part 1. Please respond to the following statements by circling one response which best indicates whether you (SA) Strongly Agree, (A) Agree, (U) are Undecided, (D) Disagree or (SD) Strongly Disagree with each statement.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | As a result of the inservice training sessions, I have a greater understanding of how first graders learn to read. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. | The inservice training sessions have helped me to effectively participate in a first grade classroom. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. | As a result of the inservice training sessions, I have a greater understanding of the concerns and responsibilities that a first grade teacher has toward the instruction of reading and language arts. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. | The topics presented in the inservice training sessions were helpful to me in understanding my role in the classroom. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. | I understand how the Houghton-Mifflin reading series is to be used at the first grade level. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. | During the inservice training sessions, I learned many activities and instructional methods which may be used in the teaching of reading and language arts with first grade pupils. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. | These inservice sessions have made me aware of the instructional resources made available by our school system. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. | After the inservice training session, I felt prepared to help children develop and use reading and language arts skills. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | I shared information from the inservice training sessions with the first grade teacher(s) to whom I am assigned. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 10. | The teacher(s) I work with has shared ideas and shown me ways to become better at helping pupils develop and use reading and language arts skills. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 11. | I used the Resource Guide and Handbook on at least a weekly basis. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 12. | The Resource Guide and Handbook was very useful to me in the instruction of reading and language arts skills. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

Part 2. As required by the Department of Education, for the State of Ohio, please indicate below the AVERAGE number of sessions you work with target students per week; the AVERAGE number of students, where appropriate, and number of minutes per session. A session is defined as a block of time in which you provide direct service to target pupils, individually or in a small group. The calculation of the average number of sessions and average number of minutes pupils are served is based upon a typical week in which instruction was provided by the categories listed below.

| | AVERAGE | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Sessions Per Week | Number of Students Per Session | Number of Minutes Per Session |
| 1. Individualized Instruction | | | |
| a. Writing Skills | _____ | N/A | _____ |
| b. Reading | _____ | N/A | _____ |
| 2. Small Group Instruction | | | |
| a. Writing Skills | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. Reading | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Appendix C

Table C-1
Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Total Reading and Oral Comprehension Pretest and Posttest Raw Scores Reported for Kindergarten
1990-91

| Test | Number of Test Items | Number of Pupils | Pretest | | | | Posttest | | | | Average Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Min. | Max. | Average Correct | Standard Deviation | Min. | Max. | Average Correct | Standard Deviation | |
| Total Reading | 31 | 140 | 4 | 26 | 15.7 | 4.1 | 12 | 31 | 21.7 | 3.8 | 6.0 |
| Oral Comprehension | 15 | 140 | 2 | 15 | 7.7 | 2.7 | 5 | 15 | 10.6 | 2.3 | 2.9 |

Table C-2
Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation of the Total Reading and Oral Comprehension Pretest and Posttest Percentiles Reported for Kindergarten
1990-91

| Test | Number of Pupils | Pretest | | | | Posttest | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Min. | Max. | Median Percentile | Standard Deviation | Min. | Max. | Median Percentile | Standard Deviation |
| Total Reading | 140 | 1 | 96 | 14 | 20.9 | 1 | 98 | 35 | 26.6 |
| Oral Comprehension | 140 | 3 | 97 | 21 | 21.9 | 1 | 96 | 36 | 26.3 |

Table C-3
Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation of
the Total Reading Pretest and Posttest Raw Scores
Reported for Grade 1
1990-91

| | Pretest | | | | | Posttest | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Pupils | Number of Test Items | Min. | Max. | Average Correct | Standard Deviation | Number of Test Items | Min. | Max. | Average Correct | Standard Deviation | Average Change |
| 723 | 54 | 8 | 54 | 44.1 | 7.5 | 89 | 24 | 89 | 66.1 | 13.6 | 22.0 |

Table C-4
Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation of
the Total Reading Pretest and Posttest Percentiles
Reported for Grade 1
1990-91

| | | Pretest | | | | Posttest | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Number of Pupils | Min. | Max. | Median Percentile | Standard Deviation | Min. | Max. | Median Percentile | Standard Deviation |
| 1 | 723 | 1 | 84 | 9 | 19.4 | 1 | 99 | 15 | 27.7 |

Table C-5
Dates and Topics of Inservice Meetings for
Kindergarten and First Grade Assistants

| Date | Topic |
|---|---|
| Sept. 7, 1990 | Introduction to the Instructional Assistant Program |
| Sept. 10, 1990 | Reading and Evaluation Guidelines for 1990 |
| Sept. 11, 1990 | Beginning Reading |
| Sept. 12, 1990 | Reading, Screening and Selection |
| Sept. 13, 1990 | Manuscript |
| Sept. 18, 1990 | Child Growth and Development and Classroom Management |
| Sept. 20, 1990 | Handwriting and Evaluation Guidelines |
| Sept. 25, 1990 | Children's Literature (17th Ave. Library) |
| Sept. 27, 1990 | Creative Writing and the Basal Reader |
| Oct. 2, 1990 | Developing Math Concepts |
| Oct. 4, 1990 | Lesson Plans and Record Keeping |
| Oct. 10, 1990 | Storytelling |
| Oct. 30, 1990 & Nov. 1, 1990 | Working with Mathematic Concepts and Manipulatives |
| Nov. 27-28, 1990 | Hougton-Miffin Reading Series |
| Jan. 29, 1991 | Reading Strategies |